REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

The office action of March 18, 2008 acted upon claims 1-6, 8-10, 13-22, 24-38 and 40-46. Claims 42 and 45 were objected to as being substantial duplicates of claim 1. Claims 1, 21, 42, 45 and 46 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-46 were rejected under 35 USC 101 as being directed to non-statutory matter. Claim 1 was rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

A terminal disclaimer is being filed concurrently with this Response. Claims 1-6, 8-10, 13-22, 24-38, and 40-46 are again presented in the belief that they recite allowable subject matter.

§ 101 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-46 under § 101, as being directed to non-statutory matter.

Specifically, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 21, 42, 45 and 46, and all claims depending therefrom, under § 101, for the following reason:

The independent claim [sic] 1, 21, 42, 45 and 46 are directed to a computer-implemented method of searching an ordered database using transformed key entries, in which coded entries [sic]. Therefore, the mechanism for searching the node or list consists of coded data and auxiliary data, and wherein the required amount of auxiliary data is substantially independent of the number of keys in the node or list as

the purpose of the invention [sic]. The claimed subject matter lacks a practical application of a judicial exception...since it fails to produce a useful and tangible result, and is software per se.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. The instant claims recite a computer-implemented method, as well as limitations directed to computer hardware such as a memory. Thus, the claims do not merely describe software per se. Moreover, claims 1, 21, 42, 45 and 46 all recite a "useful and tangible result", inter alia, obtaining "a match between an input key and a key entry".

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 21, 42, 45 and 46, and all claims depending therefrom, are free of the deficiencies identified by the Examiner under § 101.

§ 112, Second Paragraph Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 21, 42, 45 and 46 under § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically, the Examiner asserted that the expression " a single claim which claims both an [sic] "a system comprising a processor executing a method and a memory for storing a directory service database" is indefinite.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. This expression does not appear in any of the instant claims. Rather, claims 1, 21, 42, 45 and 46 are all directed towards "a computer-implemented method of searching an ordered database using transformed key entries".

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 21, 42, 45 and 46, and all claims depending therefrom, are free of the deficiencies identified by the Examiner under § 112, second paragraph.

Claim Objections

The Examiner, relying on MPEP 706.03(k), has objected to claims 42 and 45 as being substantial duplicates of claim 1. Applicant respectfully traverses the claim objections. Applicant also makes reference to MPEP 706.03(k), which explicitly states that "court decisions have confirmed applicant's right to restate (i.e., by plural claiming) the invention in a reasonable number of ways. Indeed, a mere difference in scope between claims has been held to be enough".

Claims 1, 42 and 45 contain distinctly different limitations that provide each of these claims with a correspondingly different scope.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "said respective coded entry containing information corresponding to some information present in said key entry". This significant limitation is not recited by claim 42, nor by claim 45.

Claim 42 recites the limitation "wherein said information includes information resulting from at least one varying bit, said at least one varying bit including a most significant bit". This important limitation, which combines the limitations introduced in dependent claims 31 and 32, is not recited by claim 1, nor by claim 45.

Claim 45 recites the limitation "arranging said coded entries in a search-tree structure having at least one node, such that each of said at least one node includes a particular plurality of said plurality of coded entries". Claim 45 further recites the

limitation "wherein a first coded entry of said coded entries includes positional information relating to a first key entry, and wherein a second coded entry of said coded entries includes positional information relating to a second key entry, said second key entry being different from said first key entry." These significant limitations are not recited by claim 1, nor by claim 42.

Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the claim objections to claims 42 and 45.

Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejection

Claim 1 has been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, as being unpatentable over at least one claim of U.S. Patent No. 7,076,602. The Examiner initially refers to claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent No. 7,076,602, but subsequently relies on claim 31 of U.S. Patent No. 7,076,602, leading Applicant to understand that there is a mistake in the text of the Examiner's Action. In this response, Applicant assumes that the Examiner meant to refer solely to claim 1.

The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious "to interchangeably 'storing a plurality of key entries' [sic] to 'performing of each key entry of said plurality of key entries so as to obtain a plurality of coded entries' in order to provide an identification of whether a range boundary is closed or open".

In addition to Applicant's arguments provided in the previous Response, Applicant notes that the additional limitation introduced to previously presented claim 1, "said respective coded entry containing information corresponding to some

information present in said key entry", is not taught, nor fairly suggested by the reference cited by the Examiner.

Thus, Applicant steadfastly maintains that previously presented claim 1 is indeed patentably distinct from the cited claim of U.S. Patent No. 7,076,602.

Nonetheless, in order to expedite prosecution, a terminal disclaimer is being filed concurrently with this Response to overcome the double-patenting rejection.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-6, 8-10, 13-22, 24-38, and 40-46 are in condition for allowance. Prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark M. Friedman
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 33,883

U.S. Telephone Number:
(301)9521011

Date: August 18, 2008